



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,950	11/05/2003	Elmer G. Fridrich	EF-101E	7154
37053	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
D.A. STAUFFER PATENT SERVICES LLC 1006 MONTFORD ROAD CLEVELAND HTS., OH 44121-2016				HINES, ANNE M
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2879		

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,950	FRIDRICH, ELMER G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anne M. Hines	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/12/2004.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is longer than 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beesley (US Pat. No. 3,364,378).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Beesley discloses a method for mounting a light source in a lamp, wherein the light source comprises an end (Fig. 4, 7) with a lead wire (Fig. 4, 5 & 21) extending therefrom, the method comprising the steps of: forming the light source end with an outward-opening cavity (Fig. 4) about the lead wire; extending the lead wire through the cavity (Fig. 4, 5); extending a support wire (Fig. 4, 28 & 16-18; Column 3, lines 48-50) from a supporting structure of the lamp; and hooking the support wire into the cavity (Fig. 4; Column 3, lines 48-52).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Beesley further discloses wherein the support wire (Fig. 4, 17) is attached to the lead wire (Fig. 4, 21).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Beesley further discloses wherein a loop is formed at an outer wire end of the support wire (Fig. 4, see loop formed where the labeled portions 17 and 18 of the support wire meet); and a portion of the loop is attached to the lead wire (Fig. 4; Column 2, lines 51-53).

Regarding claim 6, Beesley further discloses wherein the lamp comprises at least one double ended light source (Fig. 4) comprising first and second lead wires extending respectively from first and second opposed light source ends (Fig. 4, 5), the method further comprising the steps of: forming first and second outward-opening cavities in the respective first and second light source ends (Fig. 4; Fig. 5) about the respective first and second lead wires; extending the respective first and second lead wires through the respective first and second cavities (Fig. 4, 5); extending first and second support wires from a supporting structure of the lamp (Fig. 4, 28 & 16-18; Column 3, lines 56-63); and hooking the first and second support wires into the respective first and second cavities (Fig. 4, 28; Column 3, lines 56-63).

Regarding claim 7, Beesley further discloses wherein the first and second support wires (Fig. 4, 17; Column 3, lines 56-63) are attached to the respective first and second lead wires (Fig. 4, 21; Column 3, lines 56-63).

Regarding claims 10 and 16, Beesley further discloses wherein the support wire is mechanically and electrically attached to the lead wire for providing both support and electrical connection to the light source (Column 1, lines 43-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley (US Pat. No. 3,364,378).

Regarding claims 4 and 14, Beesley teaches wherein an attachment between the lead wire and a portion of the loop that is outward of a hooked portion of the support wire (Fig. 4; also see claim 3 rejection). Beesley fails to teach wherein the support wire places the lead wire in tension between the light source end and the point of lead wire-to-support wire loop attachment. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that having the support wire place the lead wire in tension between the light source end and the point of lead wire-to-support wire loop attachment prevents the lead wire from making electrical contact with another portion of the support structure or lamp and thereby prevents electrical shorts. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the lamp of Beesley to place the lead wire in tension between the light source end and the point of attachment to the support wire in order to prevent electrical shorts.

Regarding claim 8, Beesley teaches wherein the light source is held between the hooked first and second support wires (Fig. 4; Column 3, lines 56-63). Beesley fails to teach wherein the first and second support wires apply compressive end-to-end force

on the light source. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that placing a compressive force on the light source with the first and second support wires makes the light source more stable and can prevent movement due to environmental vibrations. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the lamp of Beesley by placing a compressive force on the light source with the first and second support wires in order to make the light source more stable.

Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley (US Pat. No. 3,364,378) and further in view of Thomas et al. (US Pat. No. 5,138,228).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Beesley teaches wherein an elbow is formed in the support wire and the elbow is used to hook the support wire into the cavity (Fig. 4, 29). Beesley fails to teach wherein the cavity has a bugled end. Thomas teaches wherein the cavity of a lamp has a bugled end (Fig. 1, see ends of cavity of lamp) in order to manage heat flow from the arc chamber of the lamp and increase the efficiency (Column 1, line 66 through Column 2, line 2). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the lamp of Beesley to have end cavities with bugled ends, as disclosed by Thomas, in order to manage heat flow from the arc chamber of the lamp and increase the efficiency.

Claims 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beesley (US Pat. No. 3,364,378) and further in view of Gagnon et al. (US Pat. No. 4,480,296).

Regarding claim 9, Beesley teaches wherein the lamp has a double ended light source. Beesley fails to teach wherein the lamp comprises two light sources and wherein the light sources are mounted in a crossed configuration. Gagnon teaches the lamp comprises two light sources (Fig. 1, 18 & 20) and wherein the light sources are mounted in a crossed configuration (Fig. 1, 18 & 20; Column 3, lines 41-47) in order to form a rectangular light source (Column 3, lines 30-33). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the lamp of Beesley to have two light sources mounted in a crossed configuration, as disclosed by Gagnon, in order to form a rectangular light source.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katougi et al. (US Pat. No. 6,153,972) and further in view of Gagnon et al. (US Pat. No. 4,480,296).

Regarding claim 17, Katougi teaches a method for mounting first and second spaced-apart light sources in a lamp (Fig. 1, 51; Column 7, lines 30-35), wherein each of the two light sources comprises an encapsulated incandescent filament extending along a longitudinal axis of the light source (Fig. 1, 54; Column 7, lines 30-35). Katougi fails to teach wherein the method comprises the step of: mounting the first and second light sources in a crossed configuration wherein a first longitudinal axis of the first light source is approximately normal to a plane containing a second longitudinal axis of the

second light source. Gagnon teaches mounting the first and second light sources in a crossed configuration wherein a first longitudinal axis of the first light source is approximately normal to a plane containing a second longitudinal axis of the second light source (Fig. 1, 18 & 20; Column 3, lines 41-47) in order to form a rectangular light source (Column 3, lines 30-33). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the lamp of Katougi to have two light sources mounted in a crossed configuration, as disclosed by Gagnon, in order to form a rectangular light source.

Regarding claim 18, Katougi further teaches wherein the first and second light sources are connected in series across a voltage source for the lamp (Fig. 1; Column 1, lines 15-18). Motivation to combine is the same as in claim 17 rejection.

Other Prior Art Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mc Vey et al. US Pat. No. 4,012,655

Beeninga et al. US Pat. No. 2,888,585

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Hines whose telephone number is (571) 272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anne Hines
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879

ANT
8/16/05

MAR 8 2005
MARICELI SANTIAGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER